

REMARKS


In view of the above election and the following remarks, Applicants believe this response to be a full and complete response to the Office Action.

While the Office Action correctly notes various patentably distinct species of the claimed invention, the Examiner has provided no basis for the election requirement. Although, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes that “[u]pon the allowance of a generic claim . . .,” the Examiner has not identified any generic claim. An unsupported allegation by the Examiner is not believed sufficient to support the required restriction. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner explain the grounds for election requirement in accordance with the practice applicable to election of species. In addition, the species set forth in the presently pending claims are sufficiently related so that a thorough search for the subject matter of one species claims would necessarily encompass a search for the other species claims. Further, the claims recite only a reasonable number of species. Thus, Applicant submits that all the claims and the claimed species can be searched and examined for further prosecution without any serious burden to the Examiner. It is further submitted that in view of the fees charged for filing of divisional patent applications, and prosecution and maintaining the resulting patents place an undue burden on the Applicant, which justifies that any restriction or election requirement be clearly supported and made according to the patent examining procedure.

A complete claim listing with certain claims having the status identifier “withdrawn” has been provided merely to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.121 and it should not be deemed as an admission that the restriction/election requirement is proper. Claims with the status identifier “original” are the claims readable on the elected species.

Based upon the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the species election requirement and early allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Nanda P.B.A. Kumar
Registration No. 44,853
Attorney for Applicant

July 8, 2005

REEDSMITH LLP
2500 One Liberty Place
1650 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-7301
Fax: (215) 851-1420